DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 403 198 SO 026 964

AUTHOR Jamieson-Inderbitzin, Liselotte M.
TITLE A Comparative Follow-Up Study of B.S. Graduates in Criminal Justice.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 100p.; Master's Research Field Study, Ferris State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Career Education; *College Instruction; *College Programs; *Criminology; Higher Education; *Law Related Education; *Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS *Ferris State University MI

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine if the students who graduated from Ferris State University (Michigan) with a bachelor's degree in criminal justice were satisfied with their education and career choices. A questionnaire was mailed to all graduates of Ferris State University's Bachelor's program in criminal justice between 1991 and 1994. The sample size was 520, and 207 responded (40%). The criminal justice program has been one of the largest at the University, with an average graduating class of 120 per year through the 1990s. Students must maintain a grade point average of 2.5 to gain admittance to the criminal justice upper division. Based on the findings of this research project, the study concludes that the graduates are very satisfied with their education and career choices. The respondents would advise other individuals to attend the criminal justice program at Ferris State. Respondents expressed high regard for the academic quality of the faculty, their availability, their willingness to help students, and their classroom skills. Respondents expressed some dissatisfaction in the areas of instruction, interpersonal communication, writing skills, and hands-on (i.e. defensive tactics) training. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 403 198

A COMPARATIVE FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF B.S. GRADUATES IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE

A RESEARCH FIELD STUDY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
FOR A MASTERS OF SCIENCE
CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION DEGREE AT
FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Liselotte M.
Jamieson-Inderbitzin

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SO 026 964

Prepared by
Liselotte M. Jamieson-Inderbitzin, B.S.
College of Education
Ferris State University
Big Rapids, MI

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Research Field Study

EDUC 512

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to determine if the students who graduated from Ferris State University with a bachelor's degree in Criminal Justice were satisfied with their education and career choices.
A questionnaire was mailed to all graduates of Ferris State University's Bachelor's program in criminal justice between the years 1991 and 1994.

The criminal justice program has been one of the largest programs on the campus of Ferris State University with an average graduating class of 120 per year through the 1990's. These students must maintain a grade point average of 2.5 to gain admittance to the Criminal Justice upper division. This program is highly competitive due to the fact that there are approximately 600 students as of this date on campus that are pre-criminal justice and in the upper division criminal justice programs.

Descriptive statistics were computed for each variable; interrelationships among the variable were cross-tabulated; and, where appropriate, simple and partial correlations were computed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter I: THE PROBLEM

Introduction to the Problem..... 1

Purpose of the Study..... 2

Research Questions..... 2

Scope and Limitations of the Study..... 2-3

Definition of Terms..... 3-4

Assumptions..... 4

Outline of the Remainder of the Report..... 5

Chapter II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Background..... 6-8

Chapter III: METHODOLOGY OR PROCEDURE

Description of Research Methodology or Approach..... 9

Research Design..... 9

Pilot Studies..... 9-10

Selection of Subjects..... 10

Instrumentation..... 10-11

Procedures..... 11

Data Collection and Recording..... 11

Analysis..... 11-12

Chapter IV: RESEARCH FINDINGS

Introduction..... 13

Description of the Analysis Procedures Used..... 13

Hypotheses/Research Questions and Results..... 13-14

Composite/Table of Question 1..... 15

Composite/Table of Question 2..... 16

Composite/Table of Question 3..... 17

Composite/Table of Question 4..... 18

Composite/Table of Question 5..... 19

Composite/Table of Question 6..... 20

Composite/Table of Question 7..... 21

Composite/Table of Question 8..... 22

Composite/Table of Question 9..... 23

Composite/Table of Question 10..... 24

Composite/Table of Question 11..... 25

Composite/Table of Question 12..... 26

Composite/Table of Question 13..... 27

Composite/Table of Questions 14-26..... 28

Composite/Table of Question 27..... 29

Composite/Table of Question 28..... 30

Composite/Table of Question 29..... 31

Composite/Table of Questions 30-39..... 32

Composite/Table of Question 40..... 33

Composite/Table of Question 41..... 34

Composite/Table of Question 42..... 35

Composite/Table of Question 43..... 36

Composite/Table of Question 44..... 37

Composite/Table of Question 45..... 38

Composite/Table of Question 46..... 39

Composite/Table of Question 47..... 40

Composite/Table of Question 48..... 41

Composite/Table of Questions 4 & 43..... 42

Composite/Table of Questions 4 & 44..... 43

Composite/Table of Questions 4 & 42..... 44

Composite/Table of Questions 4 & 41..... 45

Composite/Table of Questions 4 & 40..... 46

Composite/Table of Questions 4 & 45..... 47

Summarization and, or Explanation of Findings..... 48

Link to Literature..... 48-49

Chapter V: SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Restatement of the Problem..... 50

Main Features of the Method..... 50-51

List of the Main Findings..... 51-52

Conclusion Based on the Findings..... 52-53

Methodological Limitations..... 53

Recommendations for Future Study..... 53

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 54-55

APPENDIXES..... 56

Cover Letter..... 57

Graduate Questionnaire..... 58-61

Follow-up Letter..... 62

QUESTIONNAIRE REPORTS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Chapter I

The Problem/Research Purpose

Introduction to background of the problem.

Ferris State University is a post-secondary institution with both two and four year degree programs, as well as masters and two doctorate programs. Ferris State University is located in Big Rapids, Michigan and serves students from the whole United States as well as students from various foreign countries. In the Fall semester of 1995, approximately 10,000 academic and skilled trades students were enrolled in courses and programs on the Campus as well as various extension sites.

The criminal justice program has experienced a continued history of growth and expansion from the program's inception in 1972 with one instructor and 52 students. Presently in 1996 there are 599 students enrolled and a full-time faculty consisting of seven members.

Graduates from the criminal justice program seek employment with law enforcement agencies through out the State of Michigan as well as the remaining 49 states. Ferris State University is committed to meeting the needs of the students academically as well as ensuring the employability of its graduates.

Purpose of the Study.

The purpose of this study was to survey graduates of Ferris State University's Criminal Justice program in order to determine the employment pattern and satisfaction level of their training.

Research Questions.

1. What is the level of satisfaction of the graduates with the services offered at Ferris State University?
2. What is the level of satisfaction of the graduates with the quality of the instruction they received?
3. Is there a relationship between satisfaction level and employment patterns?
4. What is the demographic profile of the graduates?
5. What is the labor market profile of the graduates?

Scope and Limitations of the Study.

The problems inherent in this type of research, as well as in the methodology employed, place several limitations on the conclusions that can be drawn from the findings of this study.

1. All the information gathered in this study was self-reported by the respondents. Therefore, the accuracy of the information is unverified and dependent upon the honesty and accurate memory of each of the respondents. Although it can be argued that the respondents might be

reporting higher levels of success than more objective observations would indicate, there is no reason to believe that this phenomenon would occur to any greater extent in one group than another.

2. The fact that this research was based only on graduates from Ferris States University's Criminal Justice program limits generalization concerning the data to that school.

The graduate survey questionnaire was mailed on October 13, 1995, to 520 criminal justice graduates from the years 1991 through 1994. A follow-up letter was mailed on November 10, 1995. The overall response to the questionnaire was 207 students (40%).

Definition of Terms.

In an effort to clarify terms used in a particular manner in this study, the following definitions are provided:

Criminal Justice: In the generic sense, criminal justice refers to the entire process or system to which an individual could be exposed from the point of commission of a crime to the point of rehabilitation. This includes the police, the courts, and correctional agencies. These are referred to as the criminal justice system. In terms of academic programs, criminal justice refers to a unified program under which all the agencies and the relationships are considered together.

Outline of the Remainder of the Report.

Within Chapter II, is a review of selected literature related to the content of the study. This chapter represents published information on the success rate of law enforcement officials with higher education. There is a correlation with college education and job satisfaction. Chapter III presents information that describes the research design, methodology, which includes the graduate subjects, instrumentation and data analysis. Chapter IV provides analysis and interpretation of the data collected from the survey. A brief summary of findings is also attached to each question. Chapter V, Summary and Conclusions, contains a synopsis of the major findings of this study and a discussion of the nature of the conclusions that can be drawn.

Criminal justice education: The criminal justice system is designed to facilitate the achievement of certain goals, which include; the identification, the accusation, the conviction, the punishment, and the correction of those who offend societal norms. In order to permit achievement of these goals, the criminal justice system has been subdivided into the crime prevention and control process; the protection and enforcement process; the judicial process; the correction process; the administration, management, and organizational change process; and the research, evaluation, and planing process. Criminal justice education, therefore, begins with the scientific study of crime and criminals and ends with a holistic understanding of the criminal justice system and/or each individual subdivision contained therein. (American Society, 1977).

Assumptions.

The following assumptions are made with respect to this field study?

1. The survey instrument used is a valid document.
2. The survey respondents (graduates) are truthful and accurate in their answers reflected within the questionnaire.
3. The information will be helpful in enhancing the quality of the criminal justice program.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Background.

Graduates from the criminal justice program seek employment with law enforcement agencies within the State of Michigan as well as the remaining 49 states. Ferris State University is committed to meeting the needs of the students academically as well as ensuring the employability of its graduates.

A computerized literature search was made using the following data bases: Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS). This search covered the years 1972 to 1993, within this time frame I found 13 articles to be relevant to the research.

Since the late 1960's and early 1970's criminal justice education has been expanding emphasis on major events, two of theses are:

1. There has been a major increase on the emphasis of career preparation in higher education.
2. There have been major increases in pay scales for various careers in criminal justice.

There are currently three general trends or philosophies represented in the various criminal justice programs across the country:

1. Humanistic-social, which attempt to develop the "whole person" who understands the problems of society.
2. Technical-vocation, which stressed development of competency in specific skills deemed essential for criminal justice practitioners.
3. Professional-managerial, which stresses management skills required of agency managers and tends to de-emphasize social science and humanities perspective.

The report on criminal justice education prepared by John Jay College further supported this contention and pointed out that their survey results illustrated discrepancies between purported philosophy and actual course offerings. It also suggested that it would be more appropriate to describe existing philosophies on a continuum with agency-training-type programs on one extreme and academic social science or theoretical programs on the other. The John Jay College report also found a strong trend in the field toward the theoretical or academic end of the continuum.(Pearson, p 131-133). Ferris State University is clearly representative of this trend and which strengthens the usefulness of these research findings.

It is generally assumed that organizations are arranged in a hierarchical fashion, therefore, positions within this structure are also arranged in hierarchical or pyramidal order. Education then becomes a

proxy for qualities the employer values and also predicts a higher level of performance without necessarily making any direct contribution to it. Education, in effect, represents "a service, the supply of which automatically creates its own demand by virtue of the flexibility of hiring standards for jobs." (Blaug, 1972).

Other authors such as Taubman and Wales offered similar arguments supporting Blaug. Arrow, on the other hand, presented a more rigorous version of the screening hypothesis by suggesting that individual productive ability is totally unaffected by education. (Arrow, 1973).

Taubman and Wales devised a test of the screening hypotheses by estimating predicted occupational distributions by educational level under the assumption of free choice into occupations and comparing those with the actual distributions. They found that people with less education were disproportionately underrepresented in high-paying occupations and suggested that screening accounted for a substantial portion of educational-earnings differentials (perhaps 50% or more). Research by others, however, cast some questions about the extent of screening and its effect on earnings. (Taubman and Wales, 1973).

Chapter III

METHODOLOGY OR PROCEDURE

Description of Research Methodology or Approach.

This research study is non-experimental and descriptive in nature. The researcher will mail questionnaires to graduates of the Ferris State University's Criminal Justice program from the years 1991 through 1994. The independent variable in this study is the student satisfaction level of their training program. It is also used to determine the employment pattern of Ferris State University graduates.

Research Design.

Surveys are used in educational research for a wide variety of purposes. Schools use surveys to evaluate their courses and programs. The researcher will mail a questionnaire to Ferris State University graduates of the Criminal Justice program to ascertain what impact the program had on their job readiness, job satisfaction, etc. These graduates will be asked to complete the survey and return it in the addressed, postage paid enclosed envelope.

Pilot Studies.

The questionnaire will be reviewed by three experts: (1) a researcher, (2) a content expert, and (3) a data entry person. Following a

review by these experts the questionnaire will be pilot tested by an upper-level criminal justice class.

Selection of Subjects.

Of the approximate 10,000 enrolled students at Ferris State University with the beginning of the Fall semester of 1995, approximately 120 of those students graduated from the criminal justice program.

The subjects for the study will be from a Registrar's list of all graduates of the Ferris State University's Criminal Justice program from the years 1991 through 1994. The overall response to the questionnaire was 207 graduates (40%). The majority (75%) of graduates completed the Law Enforcement track, were predominately male (77%), from middle class backgrounds, and were between the ages of 21 to 28 years old.

Instrumentation.

The instrument used will be a self developed questionnaire with multiple choice items and Likert type items. The questionnaire will be reviewed by three experts: (1) a researcher, (2) a content expert, and (3) a data entry person. Following the review by these experts the questionnaire will be pilot tested by an upper-level criminal justice class.

To ensure the validity of this survey the graduates were not asked to identify themselves by name or indicate whom they were on any part of

this questionnaire. All graduates were informed as to the purpose of this survey.

Procedures.

The survey will be mailed to the subjects around the middle of October 1995. A personalized letter will explain the significance of the study, and will ask that the respondents consider their experiences in and out of the classroom when answering the questions. Subjects will be requested to return the survey within a two-week period. A stamped self-addressed envelope will be included for return of the survey.

Data Collection and Recording.

The survey was mailed to each participant at the address provided by the Registrar's office. The survey's were numbered only to keep track of return and not to send follow-up letters to individuals that had already replied.

Analysis.

After the results of the survey have been received, it will be tabulated. The data will be analyzed by calculating means, frequencies, and percentages, as appropriate for each data item. Charts and graphs will be

prepared to illustrate the findings. Chi-square analysis will be used to compare profiles.

CHAPTER IV

Research Findings

Introduction.

The research study will be of a non-experimental descriptive design. This research project attempted to place some light on the following questions: Are graduates of the criminal justice program satisfied with their career choices? Are the graduates satisfied with their education? Would they choose this field of study if they had to start over? etc.?

Description of the Analysis Procedures Used.

The instrument used was a questionnaire developed by myself using as a base, a questionnaire produced by Northeast Missouri State University. The questionnaire was pilot tested by an upper level criminal justice class at Ferris State University, and was reviewed by the criminal justice faculty, as three experts: (1) a researcher, (2) a content expert, and (3) a data entry person. The survey was then mailed to the subjects with a letter of explanation.

Hypotheses/Research Questions and Results.

What is the profile of the respondents? Gender, age-group, and ethnic origin can be determined from this survey, (questions 42, 43, 44 and

45). Questions 40 and 41 were used to determine the type of degree and the year of attainment.

Question 1: Are you employed in the Criminal Justice arena?

Working Full-time	164
Working Part-time	8
Looking for a job	9
Enrolled in Grad School	4
Military Service	2
No Pursuit of CJ	1
Another Field	10
Voluntary no CJ	9
No Opinion	0
Total	207

Seventy nine percent (79%) of the respondents are employed full-time. Four percent (4%) are employed on a part-time basis within the criminal justice arena.
Four percent (4%) are still looking for a job in this field.
Ten percent (10%) have decided not to pursue a career in criminal justice.

Question 2: What kind of agency are you employed by?

Police Department	117
Private Investigation	2
Probate Court	3
Juvenile Corrections	2
Adult Corrections	21
Contract Security	1
Proprietary Security	5
College/University	2
Federal Law Enforcement	1
State Investigative	1
Consulting Service	1
Other	45
No Opinion	6
Total	207

Fifty-six percent (56%) are employed in police departments.
Thirteen percent (13%) are employed in either a juvenile or adult correctional setting.
Three percent (3%) are employed in security work.

Question 3: How satisfied are you in your career?

Very Satisfied	132
Somewhat Satisfied	52
Unsatisfied	19
No Opinion	4
Total	207

Sixty four percent (64%) of the respondents are very satisfied with their careers.
Twenty five percent (25%) are somewhat satisfied.
Nine percent (9%) are unsatisfied.

Question 4: What was your GPA upon graduation from FSU?

3.75 - 4.00	15
3.50 - 3.74	24
3.25 - 3.49	40
3.00 - 3.24	45
2.75 - 2.99	58
2.50 - 2.74	21
Below 2.50	3
No Opinion	1
Total	207

Nineteen percent (19%) of the graduates achieved a GPA of greater than 3.50.
Nineteen percent (19%) of the graduates achieved a GPA of 3.25 - 3.49.
Twenty-two percent (22%)of the graduates achieved a GPA of 3.00 - 3.24.
Twenty-eight percent (28%) achieved a GPA of 2.75 - 2.99.
Ten percent (2%) achieved a GPA of 2.50 - 2.74.
One percent (1%) was below a GPA of 2.50.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Question 5: Was there any relevance of your academic performance to being hired in your position?

Yes	88
No	62
Do Not Know	54
No Opinion	3
Total	207

Forty three percent (43%) felt that there was a relevance between GPA and being hired.
Thirty percent (30%) felt that there was no relevance to GPA and being hired.
Twenty six percent (26%) did not know if GPA played a role in being hired.

Question 6: Indicate your rating of FSU at the time you applied for admission.

It was my first choice	162
It was my second choice	37
It was my third choice	7
It was my fourth choice	1
No Opinion	0
Total	207

Seventy eight percent (78%) of respondents stated that FSU was their first choice of school to attend.

Question 7: What were your three (3) most important reasons for attending FSU?

	Reason #1	Reason #2	Reason #3
Cost	12	20	27
Admission Standards	9	6	12
Social Atmosphere	1	4	14
Location	6	16	18
Type-program available	23	19	11
Academic reputation	4	7	15
Available Financial Aid	4	7	7
Advice Parents/Friend	3	7	7
Advice High School Personnel	1	6	3
To Be with Friends	3	5	9
Advice of CJ Professional	8	15	6
Reputation of CJ Program	78	35	12
Other	5	2	5
No Opinion	50	58	61
Total	207	207	207

Reason #1 = Thirty eight percent (38%) chose FSU for the CJ program.
Reason #2 = Seventeen percent (17%) chose FSU for the CJ program.
Reason #3 = Thirteen percent (13%) chose FSU for the Cost factor.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Question 8: Would you recommend FSU to another student interested in Criminal Justice?

Definitely Yes	138
Probably Yes	53
Uncertain	5
Probably No	7
Definitely No	2
No Opinion	2
Total	207

Ninety two percent (92%) of the respondents would recommend FSU's CJ program to other students.
Two percent (2%) of the respondents are uncertain about recommending FSU's CJ program to future students.
Four percent (4%) of the respondents would not recommend FSU's CJ program to other students.

Question 9: Would you recommend FSU's other programs to potential students?

Definitely Yes	56
Probably Yes	88
Uncertain	50
Probably No	8
Definitely No	4
No Opinion	1
Total	207

Seventy percent (70%) of the respondents would recommend other FSU programs to future students.
Twenty four percent (24%) of the respondents are uncertain about recommendation to FSU.
Six percent (6%) of the respondents would not recommend FSU to future students.

Question 10: Approximately how many hours per week did you spend on criminal justice homework?

Never	5
6 - 10 hours	88
11 - 15 hours	62
16 - 20 hours	36
21 - 25 hours	10
26 or more hours	3
No Opinion	3
Total	207

Two percent (2%) of the respondents never spent any time on CJ homework.
Forty three percent (43%) of the respondents spent 6 - 10 hours on CJ homework.
Thirty percent (30%) of the respondents spent 11 - 15 hours on CJ homework.
Five percent (5%) of the respondents spent 21 - 25 hours on CJ homework.
One percent (1%) of the respondents spent 26 or more hours on CJ homework.

Question 11: How often were term papers, reports or major writing assignments required in your criminal justice classes?

Never	3
Not very often	137
Often	60
Very often	6
No Opinion	1
Total	207

Sixty eight percent (68%) of respondents stated that they did not write term papers very often.
Thirty two percent (32%) of respondents stated that they wrote term papers often.

Question 12: How many hours per week did you spend in outside employment and/or doing child care while attending FSU?

0 - 9 Hours	71
10+ Hours	36
20+ Hours	61
30+ Hours	19
40+ Hours	17
No Opinion	3
Total	207

Thirty four percent (34%) of respondents worked less than 10 hours per week on other than school.
Seventeen percent (17%) of respondents worked less than 20 hours per week on other than school.
Twenty nine percent (29%) of respondents worked less than 30 hours per week on other than school.
Nine percent (9%) of respondents worked less than 40 hours per week on other than school.
Eight percent (8%) of respondents worked 40 hours per week on other than school.

Question 13: How could the criminal justice program be improved?

	Agree	Disagree	No Opinion	Total
More writing courses	141	58	8	207
More Sociology courses	55	143	9	207
More Psychology courses	63	136	8	207
More interpersonal communication courses	185	17	5	207
More hands on experience (i.e.: Defensive Tactics	183	16	8	207

Agree

Sixty eight percent (68%)of the respondents wanted more writing courses.
Twenty seven percent (27%) of the respondents wanted more sociology courses.
Thirty percent (30%) of the respondents wanted more psychology courses
Eighty nine percent (89%) of the respondents wanted more interpersonal communication courses.
Eighty eight percent (88%) of the respondents wanted more hands on training.

Disagree

Twenty eight percent (28%) of the respondents did not feel more writing courses would be beneficial.
Sixty nine percent (69%) of the respondents did not feel more sociology courses would be beneficial.
Sixty five percent (65%) of the respondents did not feel more psychology courses would be beneficial.
Eight percent (8%) of the respondents did not feel more interpersonal communication courses would be beneficial.
Seven percent (7%) of the respondents did not feel more hands on training would be beneficial.

Questions 14 - 26: What is your *impression* of FSU at the present time? *The higher the number, the more you agree with the statement on the right; the lower the number you chose, the more you agree with the statement on the left.*

	1	2	3	4	5	N/O	Total	
low quality programs	2	6	40	109	42	8	207	high quality programs
unfriendly school	3	14	34	101	53	2	207	friendly school
difficult admission process	6	12	47	47	92	3	207	simple admission process
high cost	2	21	106	63	12	3	207	low cost
poor social life	5	10	36	81	71	4	207	good social life
poor residence halls	12	22	69	58	29	17	207	good residence halls
classes inaccessible	2	9	34	101	59	2	207	easy to attend (accessible)
limited programs	6	11	53	87	44	6	207	diverse programs
poor faculty	4	1	38	83	76	5	207	good faculty
poor library	30	35	58	54	26	4	207	good library
poor facilities	6	20	67	82	26	6	207	good facilities
large school	2	15	114	51	23	2	207	small school
low quality athletics	9	20	91	57	15	15	207	high quality athletics

Seventy three percent (73%) of respondents rate FSU's programs with high marks
Seventy four percent (74%) of respondents rate FSU as a friendly school.
Sixty seven percent (67%) of respondents rate FSU's admission process as simple.
Thirty six percent (36%) of respondents rate FSU's costs as low.
Seventy three percent (73%) of respondents rate FSU's social life as good.
Forty two percent (42%) of respondents rate FSU's residence halls as good.
Seventy seven percent (77%) of respondents rate FSU's classes as easily accessible.
Sixty three percent (63%) of respondents rate FSU' as having a diversity of programs.
Seventy seven percent (77%) of respondents rate FSU's faculty as good.
Thirty nine percent (39%) of respondents rate FSU's library as good.
Fifty two percent (52%) of respondents rate FSU's facilities as good.
Thirty six percent (36%) of respondents rate FSU as a small school.
Thirty five percent (35%) of respondents rate FSU's athletics as good.

Question 27: Were you employed on a full-time basis prior to obtaining your bachelor's degree?

Yes	34
No	172
No Opinion	1
Total	207

Sixteen percent (16%) of respondents were employed full-time prior to obtaining their bachelor's degree.
Eighty three percent (83%) of respondents were never employed full-time prior to obtaining their bachelor's degree.

Question 28: How many years did you attend this university before obtaining your degree?

1 year	1
2 years	39
3 years	27
4 years	118
5 or more years	20
No Opinion	2
Total	207

Nineteen percent (19%) of respondents attended FSU for two years prior to obtaining their degree.
Thirteen percent (13%) of respondents attended FSU for three years prior to obtaining their degree.
Fifty seven percent (57%) of respondents attended FSU for four years prior to obtaining their degree.
Nine percent (9%) of respondents attended FSU for five years prior to obtaining their degree.

Question 29: What was your enrollment status while attending FSU?

Full-time	204
Part-time	2
No Opinion	1
Total	207

Ninety eight percent (98%) of respondents were full-time students while at FSU.

Questions 30 - 39: The following statement reflect goals of many college students. How much help do you feel the experiences at this university gave you in reaching these goals?

(1) This was not a goal of mine
(2) This university gave no help
(3) This university gave very little help
(4) This university gave some help
(5) This university gave very much help

	1	2	3	4	5	N/O	Total
To increase my knowledge in my academic field	1	2	6	71	124	3	207
To satisfy job and career requirements	1	7	26	76	93	4	207
to obtain a degree or certificate	0	0	10	44	149	4	207
to learn skills that will enrich my daily life	10	16	68	80	29	4	207
to become actively involved in student life and activities	32	31	63	50	28	3	207
to develop greater appreciation of cultural events	47	36	68	37	16	3	207
to improve my self-image	18	26	50	78	31	4	207
to improve my leadership skills	4	16	44	82	57	4	207
To increase my earning power	3	15	46	78	60	5	207
To generally improve myself	0	12	30	103	59	3	207

Ninety four percent (94%) of respondents stated that increasing their knowledge in their academic field was a major goal and the university helped them greatly.
Eighty two percent (82%) of respondents stated that job and career requirements were major goals and the university helped them greatly.
Ninety three percent (93%) of respondents stated that being able to get certification was a major goal and the university helped them greatly.
Thirty eight percent (38%) of respondents stated that being involved in student life was important and the university helped greatly.
Forty percent (40%) of respondents stated that cultural events were not a priority.
Forty nine percent (49%) of respondents stated that improving self-image was a major goal and the university was helpful in that.
Sixty seven percent (67%) of respondents stated that improving leadership skills was a major goal and the university was helpful in that.
Sixty six percent (66%) of respondents stated that improving earning power was a major goal and the university was helpful in that.
Seventy eight percent (78%) of respondents stated that self improvement was a major goal and the university was most helpful in that.

Question 40: which year did you graduate from FSU?

1991	26
1992	53
1993	60
1994	67
No Opinion	1
Total	207

Thirteen percent (13%) of respondents graduated in 1991.
Twenty six percent (26%) of respondents graduated in 1992.
Twenty nine percent (29%) of respondents graduated in 1993.
Thirty two percent (32%) of respondents graduated in 1994.

Question 41: What was your major?

Generalist	38
Specialist	155
Both of the above	2
Security Administration	8
No Opinion	4
Total	207

Eighteen percent (18%) of respondents are generalists (corrections) graduates.
Seventy five percent (75%) of respondents are specialists (law enforcement) graduates.
Four percent (4%) of respondents are security administration graduates.

Question 42: What is your sex?

Male	159
Female	46
No Opinion	2
Total	207

Seventy seven percent (77%) of respondents are male.
Twenty two percent (22%) of respondents are female.

Question 43: What is your perception of the socioeconomic background and environment in which you were raised?

Upper class	2
Upper middle class	47
Middle class	126
Lower middle class	22
Lower class	7
No Opinion	3
Total	207

Twenty four percent (24%) of respondents classify themselves as upper middle class.
Sixty one percent (61%) of respondents classify themselves as middle class.
Fourteen percent (14%) of respondents classify themselves as lower middle class.

Question 44: How old are you?

21-24	69
25-28	121
29-32	11
33-36	1
37-40	0
41-44	2
45-over	0
No Opinion	3
Total	207

Thirty three percent (33%) of respondents were in the age group of 21-24.
Fifty eight percent (58%) of respondents were in the age group of 25-28.
Five percent (5%) of respondents were in the age gourp of 39-32.

Question 45: Which of the phrases below best describes your racial/ethnic background?

African-American/Black	5
American Indian, Alaskan Native	1
Caucasian-American/White	190
Mexican-America/Chicano	1
Asian-American, Pacific Islander	0
Puerto Rican, Cuban, other Hispanic origin	1
Other	1
Multiracial	0
Prefer not to respond	5
No Opinion	3
Total	207

Two percent (2%) of respondents classify themselves as African American/Black.
Ninety two percent (92%) of respondents classify themselves as Caucasian-American/White.

Question 46: Which state was your permanent residence *prior* to attending FSU?

Illinois	1
Michigan	202
New York	1
Other Country	1
No Opinion	2
Total	207

Ninety eight percent (98%) of the respondents are from Michigan.

Question 47: Which state is *now* your permanent residence?

Arizona	1
California	1
Colorado	1
Florida	1
Georgia	2
Illinois	2
Michigan	184
Nevada	1
North Carolina	1
Ohio	2
Pennsylvania	1
South Dakota	3
Tennessee	4
Texas	1
No Opinion	2
Total	207

Eighty eight percent (88%) of respondents claim Michigan as their permanent residence.
One percent (1%) of respondents now claim South Dakota as their permanent residence.
Two percent (2%) of respondents now claim Tennessee as their permanent residence.

Question 48: Did you transfer credits from another college or university to FSU?

Yes	109
No	95
No Opinion	3
Total	207

Fifty three percent (53%) of respondents transferred college credits to FSU from another institution.
Forty six percent (46%) of respondents had no transfer college credits.

Correlation of Question 4 with Question 43: Is GPA a reflection of socioeconomic background?

GPA	UP/CLASS	UP/MD/CLASS	MID. CLASS	LO/MD/CLASS	LOWER CLASS	TOTAL
3.75 - 4.00	1	1	12	1	0	15
3.50 - 3.74	0	4	12	7	0	23
3.25 - 3.49	0	6	28	2	3	39
3.00 - 3.24	0	12	30	1	1	44
2.75 - 2.99	1	17	31	7	2	58
2.50 - 2.74	0	6	11	3	1	21
Below 2.50	0	1	1	1	0	3
No Opinion (4)						(4)
Total 4	2	47	125	22	7	199

CHISQ = 32.713 **df = 24** **Prob = .11026** (no significant difference)

This correlation shows that there is no significant difference between socioeconomic background and the grades attained in the educational system.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Correlation of Question 4 with Question 44: Is GPA a reflection of age?

GPA	21-24	25-28	29-32	33-36	41-44	TOTAL
3.75 - 4.00	4	11	0	0	0	15
3.50 - 3.74	11	13	0	0	0	24
3.25 - 3.49	17	17	3	1	0	38
3.00 - 3.24	10	31	3	0	0	44
2.75 - 2.99	25	30	2	0	1	58
2.50 - 2.74	2	17	2	0	0	21
Below 2.50	0	2	1	0	0	3
No Opinion (4)						(4)
Total 4	69	121	11	1	1	199

CHISQ = 30.329 **df = 24** **Prob = .17408** (no significant difference)

This correlation shows that there is no significant difference between student age and the grades attained in the educational system.

Correlation of Question 4 with Question 42: Is GPA a reflection of gender?

GPA	Male	Female
3.75 - 4.00	13	2
3.50 - 3.74	17	7
3.25 - 3.49	30	9
3.00 - 3.24	36	8
2.75 - 2.99	48	10
2.50 - 2.74	11	10
Below 2.50	3	
No Opinion (3)		
Total 3	158	46

CHISQ = 11.184 **df = 6** **Prob = .08284** (no significant difference)

This correlation shows that there is no significant difference between student gender and the grades attained in the educational system.

Correlation of Question 4 with Question 41: Is GPA a reflection of major?

GPA	Generalist	Specialist	Both	Security Admin	TOTAL
3.75 - 4.00	1	14	0	0	15
3.50 - 3.74	5	16	1	0	22
3.25 - 3.49	8	31	0	0	39
3.00 - 3.24	7	35	1	1	44
2.75 - 2.99	12	42	0	4	58
2.50 - 2.74	5	15	0	1	21
Below 2.50	0	2	0	1	3
No Opinion (5)					5
Total 5	38	155	2	7	207

CHISQ = 28.789 **df = 24** **Prob = .22815** (no significant difference)

This correlation shows that there is no significant difference between student's major and the grades attained in the educational system.

Correlation of Question 4 with Question 40: Is GPA a reflection of year of graduation?

GPA	1991	1992	1993	1994	TOTAL
3.75 - 4.00	4	3	3	5	15
3.50 - 3.74	3	6	8	7	24
3.25 - 3.49	2	7	17	13	39
3.00 - 3.24	9	13	9	14	45
2.75 - 2.99	6	16	16	20	58
2.50 - 2.74	1	8	6	6	21
Below 2.50	1	0	0	2	3
No Opinion (2)					2
Total 2	2017	2045	2052	2061	207

CHISQ = 18.636 **df = 18** **Prob = .41451** (no significant difference)

This correlation shows that there is no significant difference between student's year of graduation and the grades attained in the educational system.

Correlation of Question 4 with Question 45: Is GPA a reflection of ethnicity?

GPA	African/Amer.	Amer/Indian	Caucasian	Mex.Amer/Chic	Hispanic Orig.	Prefer no ans.	Other	TOTAL
3.75 - 4.00	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	15
3.50 - 3.74	1	0	21	0	0	2	0	24
3.25 - 3.49	1	0	38	0	0	0	0	39
3.00 - 3.24	0	0	42	0	1	0	0	43
2.75 - 2.99	0	1	54	0	0	3	0	58
2.50 - 2.74	3	0	17	1	0	0	0	21
Below 2.50	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
No Opinion (4)						-		(4)
Total 4	5	1	189	1	1	5	1	199

47

CHISQ = 105.644 **df = 36** **Prob = .00000** (significant difference)

This correlation shows that there is a significant difference between ethnicity and the grades attained in the educational system.

Summarization and, or Explanation of Findings.

When the area of socioeconomic background was examined, it was found that the majority of graduates came from similar backgrounds. It was also found that it there was no significant impact on age or gender when these variable were compared to the graduates overall GPA. The education track also showed no significant impact on the overall GPA of the graduates, nor did the year that they graduated.

The only significant impact was the ethnic background, which showed a significant difference in GPA attained. Overall this study shows that there is no significant impact on where an individual comes from in order to attain the level of education to be a law enforcement professional.

Link to Literature Review.

There has been an abundance of research in the police area of the criminal justice system investigating the relationship between education and police performance. A major sophisticated study by Cohen and Chaiken found, however, that college-educated police officers generally rose through the ranks faster than non-college-educated officer. (Cohen and Chaiken, 1972). Since job satisfaction is associated with promotions, it is reasonable to assume an interrelationship between education and earnings in this area.

Thinking in terms of individual prosperity, it is suggested that education should be treated as an investment in human capital. Education enhances the productivity of the individual, and this increased the productivity subsequently reflected in increase in earrings. Therefore, a person contemplating ways of enhancing his future income should consider an investment in education as one of the alternatives.

Chapter V

Summary and Discussion

Restatement of the Problem.

The mission of the Ferris State University Criminal Justice higher education program is to educate students to be critical thinkers who can communicate their thoughts effectively in oral and written from, as well as to instill a comprehensive knowledge of the field. The program strives not only to familiarize students with facts and concepts relevant to the field of criminal justice but also, more importantly, to teach students how to apply this knowledge to related problems and changing facts and situations. Finally, the program attempts to foster the development of critical thinking and communication skill in our students, along with the ability to conceptualize ideas.

Main Features of the Method.

The graduate survey questionnaire was mailed to 520 criminal justice graduates from the years 1991 through 1994. The instrument used was a questionnaire developed by myself using as a base, a questionnaire produced by Northeast Missouri State University.

The questionnaire was pilot tested by an upper level criminal justice class at Ferris State University, and was reviewed by the criminal justice faculty, as three experts: (1) a researcher, (2) a content expert, and

(3) a data entry person. The survey was then mailed to the subjects with a letter of explanation.

List of the Main Findings.

The data from the survey questionnaire was analyzed to determine the satisfaction level of the graduates from Ferris State Universities Criminal Justice program and how this program has helped the respondents in their chosen career. Five research questions were presented in Chapter I, and the results were reported in Chapter IV. The following is a summary of the main findings for each research question addressed in this study:

Question 1: What is the level of satisfaction of the graduates with the services offered at Ferris State University?

The overall satisfaction with the services of the graduates is very high. The only problem reported is the limited resources available at Timme Library.

Question 2: What is the level of satisfaction of the graduates with the quality of the instruction they received?

The graduates rate the quality of instruction very high. The problem areas that should be looked at is more instruction in interpersonal communication, writing courses and more hands on (i.e.: defensive tactics) training. These are job specific areas of instruction.

Question 3: Is there a relationship between satisfaction level and employment patterns?

There is a direct correlation between satisfaction level and the employment patterns. Sixty-four percent (64%) of the respondents are very satisfied with their careers.

Question 4: What is the demographic profile of the graduates?

The demographic profile of the graduates is predominantly male, from middle class backgrounds, and between the ages of 21 to 28 years old.

Question 5: What is the labor market profile of the graduates?

Seventy nine (79%) of the respondents are employed full-time in the criminal justice arena.

Conclusion Based on the Findings.

Based on the findings of this research project, it can be concluded that the graduates of the Criminal Justice program are very satisfied with their education and career choices. The respondents would advise other individuals to attend Ferris State Universities Criminal Justice program. The overall conclusion expresses high regard for the faculty in the area of academic competence, positive regard for students, availability and willingness to help students and classroom skills.

The areas of some degree of dissatisfaction are the areas of interpersonal communication, writing skills and hands-on skill preparation. All the surveys emphasized the excellent reputation of the Criminal Justice program and the availability of the MLEOTC and MCOTC certifications as significant in their decision to attend Ferris State University.

Methodological Limitations.

This study was limited to graduates from the years 1991 through 1994. The sample size was 520 and only 207 responded (40%). There were some questions that should have been more clear, specific, and restricted in number.

Recommendations for Future Study.

Future studies should include follow-up research on how many graduates have attained advancement in their careers. What the income level is of the graduates? These same graduates should be studied in another five years to determine career satisfaction, due to job stress, or other influences of this type of career.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Society of Criminal Justice Arts and Sciences From the Committee on Accreditation and Standards, August 1977.

Arrow, K. *"Higher Education as a Filter."* Journal of Political Economy 2 (1973), p193-216.

Becker, G. S. Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis With Special Reference to Education. 2nd ed. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc., 1975.

Blaug, M. "The Correlation Between Education and Earnings: What Does It Signify?" Higher Education 1 (1972), p53-76.

Cohen, B., and Chaiken, J. M. Police Background Characteristics and Performance: Summary Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, 1972.

Criminal Justice Education Directory 1978-80. Gaitersburg, Md.: International Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., 1978.

Griliches, Z., and Mason, W. M. "Education, Income and Ability." Journal of Political Economy 80 (1972), pS74-S103.

Pearson et al. Criminal Justice Education. John Jay College, n.d.

Sherman, Lawrence W., and The national Advisory Commission on Higher Education for Police Officers. The Quality of Police Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1978.

Taft, P. B. "College Education for Police - The Dream and the Reality." Police Magazine 4 (1981), p8-12, p17-20.

Taubman, P., and Wales, T. "Higher Education, Mental Ability and Screening." Journal of Political Economy 81 (1973), p28-55.

Wanous, J. P., and Lawler, E. E. "Measurement and Meaning of Job Satisfaction." Journal of Applied Psychology 56 (1972), p95-105.

Wiles, P. "The Correlation Between Education and Earnings: The External-Test-Not-Content Hypothesis (ETNC)." Higher Education 3 (1974), p43-57.

APPENDIX

Survey Handouts:

Cover Letter..... 57

Graduate Questionnaire..... 58-61

Follow-up Letter..... 62

Questionnaire Reports and Additional Information

FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY

October 13, 1995

Dear Criminal Justice Graduate:

The Criminal Justice Program at Ferris is currently undergoing a comprehensive review of our program in order to identify areas or means in which we can improve the quality of education being dispensed through our program. In order to do this, we have to collect a great deal of information from our graduates concerning how they are doing. Any ideas you may have concerning the Criminal Justice Program at Ferris will be appreciated.

Therefore, we are requesting your cooperation in filling out the enclosed questionnaire. Please be as honest and frank as possible while filling out this questionnaire. We realize this is probably not your most favorite activity; however, it is very important and will assist us in reflecting the changing needs of society and providing the best possible service to our students.

The number written on the bottom of the first page of the questionnaire identifies you only for the purpose of indicating your return of the questionnaire so you will not be bothered by unnecessary follow-up reminders. Your responses will be held in the utmost confidence.

We would also like to know where you are employed for alumni records only. If you choose to tell us about your employment, please submit that on a separate sheet of paper.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. We wish you success in your career endeavors. As always, if the program or its faculty can be of service to you, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Terry M. Nerbonne

Terry M. Nerbonne, Ph.D.
Academic Coordinator

Enclosure

72

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROGRAM
1349 Cramer Circle, 501 Bishop Hall, Big Rapids, MI 49307-2737
Phone 616 592-3652

GRADUATE QUESTIONNAIRE

FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY

CRIMINAL JUSTICE GRADUATES

(1.) Are you employed in the Criminal Justice arena?

___ 1. Yes, working full time.
___ 2. Yes, working part time.
___ 3. No, but I am looking for a job.
___ 4. No, but I intend to look for a job in the next six months.
___ 5. No, I am currently enrolled or plan on enrolling in graduate school.
___ 6. No, currently in the Military Service
___ 7. No, decided not to pursue a career in Criminal Justice.
___ 8. No, at another career, unable to secure employment in the field.
___ 9. No, voluntary career change to a non-criminal justice career.

(2.) What kind of agency are you employed by?

___ 01. Police department (local, county, state)
___ 02. Private investigative agency
___ 03. Probate court
___ 04. Juvenile correctional agency
___ 05. Adult correctional agency
___ 06. Contract security agency
___ 07. Proprietary security organization
___ 08. College or university
___ 09. Federal law enforcement or investigative agency
___ 10. State investigative or enforcement agency
___ 11. Consulting service
___ 12. Other (specify)_____

(3.) How satisfied are you in your career?

___ 1. Very satisfied
___ 2. Somewhat satisfied
___ 3. Unsatisfied

(4.) What was your GPA upon graduation from FSU?

___ 1. 3.75 - 4.00 ___ 3. 3.25 - 3.49 ___ 5. 2.75 - 2.99 ___ 7.Below 2.50
___ 2. 3.50 - 3.74 ___ 4. 3.00 - 3.24 ___ 6. 2.50 - 2.74

(5.) Was there any relevance of your academic performance to being hired in your position?

___ 1. Yes
___ 2. No
___ 3. Do not know

(6.) Indicate your rating of FSU at the time you applied for admission.

___ 1. It was my first choice.
___ 2. It was my second choice.
___ 3. It was my third choice.
___ 4. It was my fourth choice or lower.

(7.) What were your three (3) most important reasons for attending FSU?
(Place a 1, 2, or 3 next to the appropriate number.)

01.___ Cost
02.___ Admissions Standards
03.___ Social Atmosphere
04.___ Location
05.___ Type of Programs Available
06.___ Academic Reputation
07.___ Availability of Scholarship/ Financial Aid
08.___ Advice of Parents or Relatives
09.___ Advice of High School Personnel
10. ___To be with Friends
11.___ Advice of Criminal Justice Professional
12.___ Reputation of Criminal Justice Program
13.___ Other(Specify) _____

(8.) Would you recommend FSU to another student interested in Criminal Justice?
___ 1. Definitely Yes
___ 2. Probably Yes
___ 3. Uncertain
___ 4. Probably No
___ 5. Definitely No

(9.) Would you recommend FSU's other programs to potential students?
___ 1. Definitely Yes
___ 2. Probably Yes
___ 3. Uncertain
___ 4. Probably No
___ 5. Definitely No

(10.) Approximately how many hours per week did you spend on criminal justice homework?
___ 1. Never
___ 2. 6 - 10 hours
___ 3. 11 - 15 hours
___ 4. 16 - 20 hours
___ 5. 21 - 25 hours
___ 6. 26 or more hours

(11.) How often were term papers, reports or major writing assignments required in your criminal justice classes? (Please mark only one)
___ 1. Never
___ 2. Not very often
___ 3. Often
___ 4. Very often

(12.) How many hours per week did you spend in outside employment and/or doing child care while attending FSU?
___ 1. 0 to 9 Hours
___ 2. 10+ Hours
___ 3. 20+ Hours
___ 4. 30+ Hours
___ 5. 40+ Hours

(13.) How could the Criminal Justice program be improved?

	Agree	Disagree
1. More writing courses	___	___
2. More Sociology courses	___	___
3. More Psychology courses	___	___
4. More interpersonal communications courses	___	___
5. More hands on experience (i.e.; Defensive Tactics)	___	___

Comments: _____

What is your impression of FSU at the present time? Please mark your feelings about the various aspects listed. The higher the number you choose, the more you agree with the statement on the right; the lower the number you chose, the more you agree with the statement on the left. Leave blank any item about which you do not know.

Example: low quality food service 1 2 3 4 (5) high quality food service

If you felt the food was of very high quality, you would circle (5).

(14.)	low quality programs	1	2	3	4	5	high quality programs
(15.)	unfriendly school	1	2	3	4	5	friendly school
(16.)	difficult admission process	1	2	3	4	5	simple admission process
(17.)	high cost	1	2	3	4	5	low cost
(18.)	poor social life	1	2	3	4	5	good social life
(19.)	poor residence halls	1	2	3	4	5	good residence halls
(20.)	classes inaccessible	1	2	3	4	5	easy to attend(accessible)
(21.)	limited programs	1	2	3	4	5	diverse programs
(22.)	poor faculty	1	2	3	4	5	good faculty
(23.)	poor library	1	2	3	4	5	good library
(24.)	poor facilities	1	2	3	4	5	good facilities
(25.)	large school	1	2	3	4	5	small school
(26.)	low quality athletics	1	2	3	4	5	high quality athletics

(27.) Were you employed on a full-time basis prior to obtaining your bachelor's degree?
___ 1. Yes
___ 2. No
If yes, how many years were you employed full-time? _____ (Do not include summer jobs.)

(28.) How many years did you attend this university before obtaining your degree?
(Check to the nearest year.)
___ 1. 1 year ___ 3. 3 years ___ 5. 5 or more years
___ 2. 2 years ___ 4. 4 years

(29.) What was your enrollment status while attending this university?
___ 1. Primarily full-time (12 semester/quarter hours or more)
___ 2. Primarily part-time (less than 12 semester/quarter hours)

The following statements reflect goals of many college students. How much help do you feel the experiences at this university gave you in reaching these goals?

This university gave very much help
This university gave some help
This university gave very little help
This university gave no help
This was not a goal of mine

	1	2	3	4	5
(30.) To increase my knowledge in my academic field					
(31.) To satisfy job and career requirements					
(32.) To obtain a degree or certificate					
(33.) To learn skills that will enrich my daily life					
(34.) To become actively involved in student life and activities					
(35.) To develop greater appreciation of cultural events					
(36.) To improve my self-image					
(37.) To improve my leadership skills					
(38.) To increase my earning power					
(39.) To generally improve myself					

(40.) Which year did you graduate from FSU?
___ 1. 1991 ___ 3. 1993
___ 2. 1992 ___ 4. 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(41.) What was your major?
___ 1. Generalist
___ 2. Specialist
___ 3. Both of the above
___ 4. Security Administration

(42.) What is your sex?
___ 1. Male ___ 2. Female

(43.) What is your perception of the socioeconomic background and environment in which you were raised?

___ 1. Upper class ___ 3. Middle class ___ 5. Lower class
___ 2. Upper middle class ___ 4. Lower middle class

(44.) How old are you?
___ 1. 21 or 24 ___ 3. 29 or 32 ___ 5. 37 to 40 ___ 7. 45 or over
___ 2. 25 or 28 ___ 4. 33 to 36 ___ 6. 41 to 44

(45.) Which of the phrases below best describes your racial/ethnic background? Please select only one response.
___ 1. African-American/Black
___ 2. American Indian, Alaskan Native
___ 3. Caucasian-American/White
___ 4. Mexican-American/Chicano
___ 5. Asian-American, Pacific Islander
___ 6. Puerto Rican, Cuban, other Hispanic origin
___ 7. Other
___ 8. Multiracial
___ 9. Prefer not to respond

State Code Number List

01. Alabama
02. Alaska
03. Arkansas
04. Arizona
05. California
06. Colorado
07. Connecticut
08. Delaware
09. District of Columbia
10. Florida
11. Georgia
12. Hawaii
13. Idaho
14. Illinois
15. Indiana
16. Iowa
17. Kansas
18. Kentucky
19. Louisiana
20. Maine
21. Maryland
22. Massachusetts
23. Michigan
24. Minnesota
25. Mississippi
26. Missouri
27. Montana
28. Nebraska
29. Nevada
30. New Hampshire
31. New Jersey
32. New Mexico
33. New York
34. North Carolina
35. North Dakota
36. Ohio
37. Oklahoma
38. Oregon
39. Pennsylvania
40. Rhode Island
41. South Carolina
42. South Dakota
43. Tennessee
44. Texas
45. Utah
46. Vermont
47. Virginia
48. Washington
49. West Virginia
50. Wisconsin
51. Wyoming
52. Other Country _____

(46.) Which state was your permanent residence ***prior*** to attending FSU? _____ (Code #)

(47.) Which state is ***now*** your permanent residence ? _____ (Code #)

(48.) Did you transfer credits from another college or university to FSU?
___ 1. No
___ 2. Yes
3. If so, Name of Community College you transferred from _____
4. or, Name of University you transferred from _____

THANK YOU!
Please use the return-addressed, stamped envelope to mail your responses by November 15, 1995.

FERRIS STATE UNIVERSITY

November 10, 1995

Dear Criminal Justice graduate:

Approximately three weeks ago we mailed you a survey for the Criminal Justice Program at Ferris as we are undergoing a comprehensive review of our program.

We requested your cooperation in filling out the questionnaire. To date we have not received your reply. Would you please take a few moments to complete and return the questionnaire. If you did not receive one and would like to help us review and improve the program, please call Helen Bacon at 616-592-3519 and request a questionnaire.

Thank you for your help and consideration in this matter. We wish you the best of success in your career. As always, if the program or its faculty can ever be of assistance to you, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Also, would you let us know where you are employed for our alumni files. If you choose to tell us about your employment, we ask that you submit that information on a separate sheet of paper.

Sincerely,

Terry N. Nerbonne
Coordinator Criminal Justice Program

SERNO

TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0

VALID CASES 206 MISSING CASES 1

Q1 CJ EMPLOYMENT?

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
WORKING FULL TIME	1	164	79.2	79.2	79.2
WORKING PART TIME	2	8	3.9	3.9	83.1
LOOKING FOR A JOB	3	9	4.3	4.3	87.4
ENROLL GRAD SCHOOL	5	4	1.9	1.9	89.4
MILITARY SERVICE	6	2	1.0	1.0	90.3
NO PURSUIT OF CJ	7	1	.5	.5	90.8
ANOTHER FIELD	8	10	4.8	4.8	95.7
VOLUNTARY NO CJ	9	9	4.3	4.3	100.0
TOTAL		207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 207 MISSING CASES 0

Q2 EMPLOYMENT AGENCY ?

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
POLICE DEPT	1	117	56.5	58.2	58.2
PRIVATE INVESTIGATIO	2	2	1.0	1.0	59.2
PROBATE COURT	3	3	1.4	1.5	60.7
JUVENILE CORRECTION	4	2	1.0	1.0	61.7
ADULT CORRECTIONS	5	21	10.1	10.4	72.1
CONTRACT SECURITY	6	1	.5	.5	72.6
PROPRIETARY SECURITY	7	5	2.4	2.5	75.1
COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	8	2	1.0	1.0	76.1
FEDERAL LAW ENFORCE	9	1	.5	.5	76.6
STATE INVESTIGATIVE	10	1	.5	.5	77.1
CONSULTING SERVICE	11	1	.5	.5	77.6
OTHER	12	45	21.7	22.4	100.0
	.	6	2.9	MISSING	
TOTAL		207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 201 MISSING CASES 6

Q3 YOUR SATISFACTION

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
VERY SATISFIED	1	132	63.8	65.0	65.0
SOMEWHAT SATISFIED	2	52	25.1	25.6	90.6
UNSATISFIED	3	19	9.2	9.4	100.0
	.	4	1.9	MISSING	
TOTAL		207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 203 MISSING CASES 4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q4 GRADUATION GPA

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
3.75 - 4.00	1	15	7.2	7.3	7.3
3.50 - 3.74	2	24	11.6	11.7	18.9
3.25 - 3.49	3	40	19.3	19.4	38.3
3.00 - 3.24	4	45	21.7	21.8	60.2
2.75 - 2.99	5	58	28.0	28.2	88.3
2.50 - 2.74	6	21	10.1	10.2	98.5
BELOW 2.50	7	3	1.4	1.5	100.0
	.	1	.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 206 MISSING CASES 1

- - - -

Q7_1 REASONS FOR FSU

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
COST	1	12	5.8	7.6	7.6
ADMISSION STANDARDS	2	9	4.3	5.7	13.4
SOCIAL ATMOSPHERE	3	1	.5	.6	14.0
LOCATION	4	6	2.9	3.8	17.8
TYPE-PROG AVAILABLE	5	23	11.1	14.6	32.5
ACADEMIC REPUTATION	6	4	1.9	2.5	35.0
AVAILABILE FIN AID	7	4	1.9	2.5	37.6
ADVICE PARENTS/FRIEN	8	3	1.4	1.9	39.5
ADVICE HS PERSONNEL	9	1	.5	.6	40.1
TO BE WITH FRIENDS	10	3	1.4	1.9	42.0
ADVICE OF CJ PRO	11	8	3.9	5.1	47.1
REPUTATION OF CJ PRO	12	78	37.7	49.7	96.8
OTHER	13	5	2.4	3.2	100.0
	.	50	24.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 157 MISSING CASES 50

- - - -

Q7_3 REASONS FOR FSU

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
COST	1	27	13.0	18.5	18.5
ADMISSION STANDARDS	2	12	5.8	8.2	26.7
SOCIAL ATMOSPHERE	3	14	6.8	9.6	36.3
LOCATION	4	18	8.7	12.3	48.6
TYPE-PROG AVAILABLE	5	11	5.3	7.5	56.2
ACADEMIC REPUTATION	6	15	7.2	10.3	66.4
AVAILABILE FIN AID	7	7	3.4	4.8	71.2
ADVICE PARENTS/FRIEN	8	7	3.4	4.8	76.0
ADVICE HS PERSONNEL	9	3	1.4	2.1	78.1
TO BE WITH FRIENDS	10	9	4.3	6.2	84.2
ADVICE OF CJ PRO	11	6	2.9	4.1	88.4
REPUTATION OF CJ PRO	12	12	5.8	8.2	96.6
OTHER	13	5	2.4	3.4	100.0
	.	61	29.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 146 MISSING CASES 61

- -

Q8 RECOMMEND FSU - CJ

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
DEFINITELY YES	1	138	66.7	67.3	67.3
PROBABLY YES	2	53	25.6	25.9	93.2
UNCERTAIN	3	5	2.4	2.4	95.6
PROBABLY NO	4	7	3.4	3.4	99.0
DEFINITELY NO	5	2	1.0	1.0	100.0
	.	2	1.0	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 205 MISSING CASES 2

- -

Q9 RECOMMEND FSU

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
DEFINITELY YES	1	56	27.1	27.2	27.2
PROBABLY YES	2	88	42.5	42.7	69.9
UNCERTAIN	3	50	24.2	24.3	94.2
PROBABLY NO	4	8	3.9	3.9	98.1
DEFINITELY NO	5	4	1.9	1.9	100.0
	.	1	.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 206 MISSING CASES 1

Q10 HOURS CJ HOMEWORK

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NEVER	1	5	2.4	2.5	2.5
6-10 HOURS	2	88	42.5	43.1	45.6
11-15 HOURS	3	62	30.0	30.4	76.0
16-20 HOURS	4	36	17.4	17.6	93.6
21-25 HOURS	5	10	4.8	4.9	98.5
26 OR MORE HOURS	6	3	1.4	1.5	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

- -

Q11 FREQUENCY OF MAJ ASSIGN

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NEVER	1	3	1.4	1.5	1.5
NOT VERY OFTEN	2	137	66.2	66.5	68.0
OFTEN	3	60	29.0	29.1	97.1
VERY OFTEN	4	6	2.9	2.9	100.0
	.	1	.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 206 MISSING CASES 1

- -

Q12 HOURS WORK/CHILD CARE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
0 TO 9 HOURS	1	71	34.3	34.8	34.8
10+ HOURS	2	36	17.4	17.6	52.5
20+ HOURS	3	61	29.5	29.9	82.4
30+ HOURS	4	19	9.2	9.3	91.7
40+ HOURS	5	17	8.2	8.3	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

- -

Q13_1 MORE WRITING COURSES

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
AGREE	1	141	68.1	70.5	70.5
DISAGREE	2	58	28.0	29.0	99.5
	5	1	.5	.5	100.0
	.	7	3.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 200 MISSING CASES 7

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q13_2 MORE SOCIOLOGY COURSES

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
AGREE	1	55	26.6	27.8	27.8
DISAGREE	2	143	69.1	72.2	100.0
	.	9	4.3	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 198 MISSING CASES 9

- -

Q13_3 MORE PSYCHOLOGY COURSES

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
AGREE	1	63	30.4	31.7	31.7
DISAGREE	2	136	65.7	68.3	100.0
	.	8	3.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 199 MISSING CASES 8

- -

Q13_4 MORE INTERPERSONAL COURS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
AGREE	1	185	89.4	91.6	91.6
DISAGREE	2	17	8.2	8.4	100.0
	.	5	2.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 202 MISSING CASES 5

- -

Q13_5 MORE HANDS ON EXP

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
AGREE	1	183	88.4	92.0	92.0
DISAGREE	2	16	7.7	8.0	100.0
	.	8	3.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 199 MISSING CASES 8

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q14 QUALITY PROGRAMS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
LOW QUALITY PROGRAMS	1	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2	6	2.9	3.0	4.0
NEUTRAL	3	40	19.3	20.1	24.1
	4	109	52.7	54.8	78.9
HIGH QUALITY PROGRAM	5	42	20.3	21.1	100.0
	.	8	3.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 199 MISSING CASES 8

- -

Q15 FRIENDLY SCHOOL

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
UNFRIENDLY SCHOOL	1	3	1.4	1.5	1.5
	2	14	6.8	6.8	8.3
NEUTRAL	3	34	16.4	16.6	24.9
	4	101	48.8	49.3	74.1
FRIENDLY SCHOOL	5	53	25.6	25.9	100.0
	.	2	1.0	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 205 MISSING CASES 2

- -

Q16 ADMISSION PROCESS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
DIFFICULT ADMIT PROC	1	6	2.9	2.9	2.9
	2	12	5.8	5.9	8.8
NEUTRAL	3	47	22.7	23.0	31.9
	4	47	22.7	23.0	54.9
SIMPLE ADMIT PROCESS	5	92	44.4	45.1	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

Q17 COST

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
HIGH COST	1	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2	21	10.1	10.3	11.3
NEUTRAL	3	106	51.2	52.0	63.2
	4	63	30.4	30.9	94.1
LOW COST	5	12	5.8	5.9	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

- -

Q18 SOCIAL LIFE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
POOR SOCIAL LIFE	1	5	2.4	2.5	2.5
	2	10	4.8	4.9	7.4
NEUTRAL	3	36	17.4	17.7	25.1
	4	81	39.1	39.9	65.0
GOOD SOCIAL LIFE	5	71	34.3	35.0	100.0
	.	4	1.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 203 MISSING CASES 4

- -

Q19 RESIDENCE HALLS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
POOR RESIDENCE HALLS	1	12	5.8	6.3	6.3
	2	22	10.6	11.6	17.9
NEUTRAL	3	69	33.3	36.3	54.2
	4	58	28.0	30.5	84.7
GOOD RESIDENCE HALLS	5	29	14.0	15.3	100.0
	.	17	8.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 190 MISSING CASES 17

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q20 CLASS ACCESSIBILITY

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
CLASSES INACCESSIBLE	1	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2	9	4.3	4.4	5.4
NEUTRAL	3	34	16.4	16.6	22.0
	4	101	48.8	49.3	71.2
EASY TO ATTEND	5	59	28.5	28.8	100.0
	.	2	1.0	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 205 MISSING CASES 2

- -

Q21 PROGRAMS DIVERSITY

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
LIMITED PROGRAMS	1	6	2.9	3.0	3.0
	2	11	5.3	5.5	8.5
NEUTRAL	3	53	25.6	26.4	34.8
	4	87	42.0	43.3	78.1
DIVERSE PROGRAMS	5	44	21.3	21.9	100.0
	.	6	2.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 201 MISSING CASES 6

- -

Q22 FACULTY

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
POOR FACULTY	1	4	1.9	2.0	2.0
	2	1	.5	.5	2.5
NEUTRAL	3	38	18.4	18.8	21.3
	4	83	40.1	41.1	62.4
GOOD FACULTY	5	76	36.7	37.6	100.0
	.	5	2.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 202 MISSING CASES 5

Q23 LIBRARY

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
POOR LIBRARY	1	30	14.5	14.8	14.8
	2	35	16.9	17.2	32.0
NEUTRAL	3	58	28.0	28.6	60.6
	4	54	26.1	26.6	87.2
GOOD LIBRARY	5	26	12.6	12.8	100.0
	.	4	1.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 203 MISSING CASES 4

Q24 FACILITIES

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
POOR FACILITIES	1	6	2.9	3.0	3.0
	2	20	9.7	10.0	12.9
NEUTRAL	3	67	32.4	33.3	46.3
	4	82	39.6	40.8	87.1
GOOD FACILITIES	5	26	12.6	12.9	100.0
	.	6	2.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 201 MISSING CASES 6

Q25 SCHOOL SIZE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
LARGE SCHOOL	1	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
	2	15	7.2	7.3	8.3
NEUTRAL	3	114	55.1	55.6	63.9
	4	51	24.6	24.9	88.8
SMALL SCHOOL	5	23	11.1	11.2	100.0
	.	2	1.0	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 205 MISSING CASES 2

Q26 ATHLETICS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
LOW QUALITY ATHLETIC	1	9	4.3	4.7	4.7
	2	20	9.7	10.4	15.1
NEUTRAL	3	91	44.0	47.4	62.5
	4	57	27.5	29.7	92.2
HIGH QUALITY ATHLETI	5	15	7.2	7.8	100.0
	.	15	7.2	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 192 MISSING CASES 15

- -

Q27 FULL TIME JOB < B.A.

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
YES	1	34	16.4	16.5	16.5
NO	2	172	83.1	83.5	100.0
	.	1	.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 206 MISSING CASES 1

- -

Q27_1 HOW LONG

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
	1	2	1.0	6.3	6.3
	2	5	2.4	15.6	21.9
	3	7	3.4	21.9	43.8
	4	6	2.9	18.8	62.5
	5	7	3.4	21.9	84.4
	6	2	1.0	6.3	90.6
	7	1	.5	3.1	93.8
	10	1	.5	3.1	96.9
	35	1	.5	3.1	100.0
	.	175	84.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 32 MISSING CASES 175

Q28 YEARS FOR A DEGREE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
1 YEAR	1	1	.5	.5	.5
2 YEARS	2	39	18.8	18.9	19.4
3 YEARS	3	27	13.0	13.1	32.5
4 YEARS	4	118	57.0	57.3	89.8
5 OR MORE	5	20	9.7	9.7	99.5
	52	1	.5	.5	100.0
	.	1	.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 206 MISSING CASES 1

Q29 ENROLLMENT STATUS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
FULL TIME	1	204	98.6	99.0	99.0
PART TIME	2	2	1.0	1.0	100.0
	.	1	.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 206 MISSING CASES 1

Q30 INCREASE KNOWLEDGE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NOT A GOAL OF MINE	1	1	.5	.5	.5
UNIV GAVE NO HELP	2	2	1.0	1.0	1.5
FSU VERY LITTLE HELP	3	6	2.9	2.9	4.4
FSU SOME HELP	4	71	34.3	34.8	39.2
FSU VERY MUCH HELP	5	124	59.9	60.8	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

Q31 SATISFY CAREER REQUIRE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NOT A GOAL OF MINE	1	1	.5	.5	.5
UNIV GAVE NO HELP	2	7	3.4	3.4	3.9
FSU VERY LITTLE HELP	3	26	12.6	12.8	16.7
FSU SOME HELP	4	76	36.7	37.4	54.2
FSU VERY MUCH HELP	5	93	44.9	45.8	100.0
	.	4	1.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 203 MISSING CASES 4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q32 OBTAIN A DEGREE/CERTIFICAT

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
FSU VERY LITTLE HELP	3	10	4.8	4.9	4.9
FSU SOME HELP	4	44	21.3	21.7	26.6
FSU VERY MUCH HELP	5	149	72.0	73.4	100.0
	.	4	1.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 203 MISSING CASES 4

- -

Q33 SKILLS TO ENRICH LIFE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NOT A GOAL OF MINE	1	10	4.8	4.9	4.9
UNIV GAVE NO HELP	2	16	7.7	7.9	12.8
FSU VERY LITTLE HELP	3	68	32.9	33.5	46.3
FSU SOME HELP	4	80	38.6	39.4	85.7
FSU VERY MUCH HELP	5	29	14.0	14.3	100.0
	.	4	1.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 203 MISSING CASES 4

- -

Q34 INVOLVE IN STUDENT ACTIV

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NOT A GOAL OF MINE	1	32	15.5	15.7	15.7
UNIV GAVE NO HELP	2	31	15.0	15.2	30.9
FSU VERY LITTLE HELP	3	63	30.4	30.9	61.8
FSU SOME HELP	4	50	24.2	24.5	86.3
FSU VERY MUCH HELP	5	28	13.5	13.7	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

- -

Q35 APPRECIATE CULTURAL EVENTS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NOT A GOAL OF MINE	1	47	22.7	23.0	23.0
UNIV GAVE NO HELP	2	36	17.4	17.6	40.7
FSU VERY LITTLE HELP	3	68	32.9	33.3	74.0
FSU SOME HELP	4	37	17.9	18.1	92.2
FSU VERY MUCH HELP	5	16	7.7	7.8	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

Q36 IMPROVE SELF IMMAGE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NOT A GOAL OF MINE	1	18	8.7	8.9	8.9
UNIV GAVE NO HELP	2	26	12.6	12.8	21.7
FSU VERY LITTLE HELP	3	50	24.2	24.6	46.3
FSU SOME HELP	4	78	37.7	38.4	84.7
FSU VERY MUCH HELP	5	31	15.0	15.3	100.0
	.	4	1.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 203 MISSING CASES 4

- -

Q37 IMPROVE LEADERSHIP SKILLS

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NOT A GOAL OF MINE	1	4	1.9	2.0	2.0
UNIV GAVE NO HELP	2	16	7.7	7.9	9.9
FSU VERY LITTLE HELP	3	44	21.3	21.7	31.5
FSU SOME HELP	4	82	39.6	40.4	71.9
FSU VERY MUCH HELP	5	57	27.5	28.1	100.0
	.	4	1.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 203 MISSING CASES 4

- -

Q38 INCREASE EARNING POWER

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
NOT A GOAL OF MINE	1	3	1.4	1.5	1.5
UNIV GAVE NO HELP	2	15	7.2	7.4	8.9
FSU VERY LITTLE HELP	3	46	22.2	22.7	31.5
FSU SOME HELP	4	78	37.7	38.4	70.0
FSU VERY MUCH HELP	5	60	29.0	29.6	99.5
	55	1	.5	.5	100.0
	.	4	1.9	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 203 MISSING CASES 4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q39 GENERAL SELF IMPROVEMENT

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
UNIV GAVE NO HELP	2	12	5.8	5.9	5.9
FSU VERY LITTLE HELP	3	30	14.5	14.7	20.6
FSU SOME HELP	4	103	49.8	50.5	71.1
FSU VERY MUCH HELP	5	59	28.5	28.9	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

Q40 YEAR OF GRADUATE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
1991	1	26	12.6	12.6	12.6
1992	2	53	25.6	25.7	38.3
1993	3	60	29.0	29.1	67.5
1994	4	67	32.4	32.5	100.0
	.	1	.5	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 206 MISSING CASES 1

Q41 MAJOR

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
GENERALIST	1	38	18.4	18.6	18.6
SPECIALIST	2	155	74.9	76.0	94.6
BOTH OF THE ABOVE	3	2	1.0	1.0	95.6
SECURITY ADMINSTRATI	4	8	3.9	3.9	99.5
	5	1	.5	.5	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

Q42 GENDER

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
MALE	1	159	76.8	77.6	77.6
FEMALE	2	46	22.2	22.4	100.0
	.	2	1.0	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 205 MISSING CASES 2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q43 SOCIOECONOMIC BACKGROUND

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
UPPER CLASS	1	2	1.0	1.0	1.0
UPPER MIDDLE CLASS	2	47	22.7	23.0	24.0
MIDDLE CLASS	3	126	60.9	61.8	85.8
LOWER MIDDLE CLASS	4	22	10.6	10.8	96.6
LOWER CLASS	5	7	3.4	3.4	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

Q44 AGE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
21 - 24	1	69	33.3	33.8	33.8
25 - 28	2	121	58.5	59.3	93.1
29 - 32	3	11	5.3	5.4	98.5
33 - 36	4	1	.5	.5	99.0
41 - 44	6	2	1.0	1.0	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

Q45 RACE

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
AFRICAN-AMERICAN	1	5	2.4	2.5	2.5
AMER INDIAN/ALASKAN	2	1	.5	.5	2.9
CAUCASIAN/WHITE	3	190	91.8	93.1	96.1
MEXICAN-AMER/CHICANO	4	1	.5	.5	96.6
HISPANIC ORIGIN	6	1	.5	.5	97.1
OTHER	7	1	.5	.5	97.5
PREFER NOT TO RESPON	9	5	2.4	2.5	100.0
	.	3	1.4	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 204 MISSING CASES 3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q46 RESIDENCE < FSU

VALUE LABEL	VALUE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	VALID PERCENT	CUM PERCENT
ILLINOIS	14	1	.5	.5	.5
MICHIGAN	23	202	97.6	98.5	99.0
NEW YORK	33	1	.5	.5	99.5
OTHER COUNTRY	52	1	.5	.5	100.0
	.	2	1.0	MISSING	
	TOTAL	207	100.0	100.0	

VALID CASES 205 MISSING CASES 2

- - - -

Q4 GRADUATION GPA BY Q43 SOCIOECONOMIC BACKGROUND

Q4	COUNT	Q43 1 UPPER CLASS	2 UPPER MIDDLE CLASS	3 MIDDLE CLASS	4 LOWER MIDDLE CLASS	5 LOWER CLASS	ROW TOTAL
3.75 - 4.00	1	1	1	12	1		15
							7.4
3.50 - 3.74	2		4	12	7		23
							11.3
3.25 - 3.49	3		6	28	2	3	39
							19.2
3.00 - 3.24	4		12	30	1	1	44
							21.7
2.75 - 2.99	5	1	17	31	7	2	58
							28.6
2.50 - 2.74	6		6	11	3	1	21
							10.3
BELOW 2.50	7		1	1	1		3
							1.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	2 1.0	47 23.2	125 61.6	22 10.8	7 3.4	203 100.0

CHI-SQUARE	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANC
PEARSON	32.71372	24	.11026
LIKELIHOOD RATIO	31.31968	24	.14478
MANTEL-HAENSZEL	.82498	1	.36373

MINIMUM EXPECTED FREQUENCY - .030
CELLS WITH EXPECTED FREQUENCY < 5 - 24 OF 35 (68.6%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS: 4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q4 GRADUATION GPA BY Q44 AGE

Q4	COUNT	Q44 21 - 24	25 - 28	29 - 32	33 - 36	41 - 44	ROW TOTAL
3.75 - 4.00	1	4	11				15
							7.4
3.50 - 3.74	2	11	13				24
							11.8
3.25 - 3.49	3	17	17	3	1		38
							18.7
3.00 - 3.24	4	10	31	3			44
							21.7
2.75 - 2.99	5	25	30	2		1	58
							28.6
2.50 - 2.74	6	2	17	2			21
							10.3
BELOW 2.50	7		2	1			3
							1.5
COLUMN TOTAL		69	121	11	1	1	203
		34.0	59.6	5.4	.5	.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
ARSON	30.32921	24	.17408
KELIHOOD RATIO	31.31602	24	.14488
MANTEL-HAENSZEL	3.17575	1	.07474

MINIMUM EXPECTED FREQUENCY - .015
CELLS WITH EXPECTED FREQUENCY < 5 - 23 OF 35 (65.7%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS: 4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q4 GRADUATION GPA BY Q42 GENDER

COUNT	Q42 MALE	Q42 FEMALE	ROW TOTAL
Q4	1	2	
1 3.75 - 4.00	13	2	15
			7.4
2 3.50 - 3.74	17	7	24
			11.8
3 3.25 - 3.49	30	9	39
			19.1
4 3.00 - 3.24	36	8	44
			21.6
5 2.75 - 2.99	48	10	58
			28.4
6 2.50 - 2.74	11	10	21
			10.3
7 BELOW 2.50	3		3
			1.5
COLUMN TOTAL	158	46	204
	77.5	22.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON	11.18441	6	.08284
*KELIHOOD RATIO	10.77397	6	.09562
NTEL-HAENSZEL	.49966	1	.47965

MINIMUM EXPECTED FREQUENCY - .676
CELLS WITH EXPECTED FREQUENCY < 5 - 4 OF 14 (28.6%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS: 3

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q4 GRADUATION GPA BY Q41 MAJOR

Q4	COUNT	Q41 GENERAL 1ST (1)	SPECIAL ST (2)	BOTH OF THE ABOV (3)	SECURITY ADMINST (4)	(5)	ROW TOTAL
3.75 - 4.00	1	1	14				15
							7.4
3.50 - 3.74	2	5	16	1		1	23
							11.3
3.25 - 3.49	3	8	31				39
							19.2
3.00 - 3.24	4	7	35	1	1		44
							21.7
2.75 - 2.99	5	12	42		4		58
							28.6
2.50 - 2.74	6	5	15		1		21
							10.3
BELOW 2.50	7		2		1		3
							1.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	38	155	2	7	1	203
		18.7	76.4	1.0	3.4	.5	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANCE
PEARSON	28.78949	24	.22815
LIKELIHOOD RATIO	23.32120	24	.50091
MANTEL-HAENSZEL	.30701	1	.57952

MINIMUM EXPECTED FREQUENCY - .015
CELLS WITH EXPECTED FREQUENCY < 5 - 26 OF 35 (74.3%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS: 4

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Q4 GRADUATION GPA BY Q40 YEAR OF GRADUATE

Q4	COUNT	Q40 1991	1992	1993	1994	ROW TOTAL
3.75 - 4.00	1	4	3	3	5	15
						7.3
3.50 - 3.74	2	3	6	8	7	24
						11.7
3.25 - 3.49	3	2	7	17	13	39
						19.0
3.00 - 3.24	4	9	13	9	14	45
						22.0
2.75 - 2.99	5	6	16	16	20	58
						28.3
2.50 - 2.74	6	1	8	6	6	21
						10.2
BELOW 2.50	7	1			2	3
						1.5
	COLUMN TOTAL	26	53	59	67	205
		12.7	25.9	28.8	32.7	100.0

CHI-SQUARE	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANC
PEARSON	18.63675	18	.41451
LIKELIHOOD RATIO	19.47764	18	.36298
MANTEL-HAENSZEL	.07090	1	.79003

MINIMUM EXPECTED FREQUENCY - .380
CELLS WITH EXPECTED FREQUENCY < 5 - 11 OF 28 (39.3%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS: 2

Q4 GRADUATION GPA BY Q45 RACE

Q4	COUNT	Q45 1 AFRICAN-AMERICAN	2 AMER IND/ALAS	3 CAUCASIAN/WHITE	4 MEXICAN-AMER/CHI	6 HISPANIC ORIGIN	7 OTHER	PREF: OT T'	F
3.75 - 4.00	1			15					
3.50 - 3.74	2	1		21					
3.25 - 3.49	3	1		38					
3.00 - 3.24	4			42		1			
2.75 - 2.99	5		1	54					
2.50 - 2.74	6	3		17	1				
BELOW 2.50	7			2			1		
	COLUMN TOTAL	5 2.5	1 .5	189 93.1	1 .5	1 .5	1 .5		2.

CHI-SQUARE	VALUE	DF	SIGNIFICANC
PEARSON	105.64453	36	.00000
LIKELIHOOD RATIO	40.51066	36	.27801
MANTEL-HAENSZEL	.03414	1	.85341

MINIMUM EXPECTED FREQUENCY - .015
CELLS WITH EXPECTED FREQUENCY < 5 - 43 OF 49 (87.8%)

NUMBER OF MISSING OBSERVATIONS: 4